

January 15, 2004

<div>Agenda</div>		<div>January 15, 2004 10:30 – 12:30</div> <div>FTA 201 Mission St San Francisco, CA</div> <div>Ted Matley (415) 744-2590</div>	
	<div>Meeting called by: Rachel Falsetti</div> <div>Facilitator: Muhaned Aljabiry</div> <div>Recorder/Time Keeper: Abhijit Bagde</div>		
	Agenda topics		
Item	Description	Time	Presentor
1	Topics/Agenda/Introductions	10:30	M. Aljabiry
2	Ground Rules	10:35	M. Aljabiry
3	Announcements / Approval of the 11/18/03 CFPG meeting minutes.	10:40	All
4	<div>Follow-Up Items from last meeting:</div> <div><div>1. Letter to survey whether CTIPS support cost Reporting change is supported by all</div><div>by next mtg.</div></div> <div><div>2. Notifications to MPOs prior to change in CTIPS for support costs to combine with Capital costs (if survey above is “Yes”)</div><div>By next mtg.</div></div> <div><div>3. Grouped projects and minor change draft guidelines</div><div>Dec. 15</div></div> <div><div>4. Obligation information received by SACOG from FTA for FY 2002</div><div>By next mtg.</div></div> <div><div>5. e-mail requesting volunteers for “Grouped projects and minor change draft guidelines” Task Force</div><div>done</div></div> <div><div>6. Meeting with Federal Resources – CT to get more Information from FADS</div><div>By next mtg.</div></div> <div><div>7. Get information from FTA on TEAM database</div><div>By next mtg.</div></div> <div><div>8. Contact CT – Local Assistance for project list for Lump sums for State administered programs</div><div>by next mtg.</div></div> <div><div>9. Updated agency contact list</div><div>Done</div></div> <div>10:45</div> <div><div>CT-FTIP</div><div>CT-FTIP</div><div>CT</div><div>Task Force</div><div>SACOG</div><div>SBCAG</div><div>CT-FTIP</div><div>SCAG</div><div>CT-FTIP</div><div>CT-FTIP</div></div>		

5	Annual listing Taskforce Progress Report	11:10	R. Ayala
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Grouped projects and minor changes. ◆ Communication process for State Managed Grouped Project Listing 	11:30	Taskforce
7	Financial Constraint of the FSTIP	11:55	A. Bagde
8	Combining Support cost in CTIPS with Capital cost	12:00	R. Falsetti
9	2004 FTIP/FSTIP workshop	12:05	R. Falsetti
10	CTIPS for 2004 FTIP/FSTIP	12:10	R. Falsetti
11	Fund Estimate	12:15	R. Falsetti
12	Q & A from November Workshop	12:20	L. Levine
13	Open Forum & Next meeting date and location 2004 CFPG Meetings March 2, 2004 SACOG April 13, 2004 FHWA May 25, 2004 MTC July 6, 2004 CT-HQ	12:25	All

	✓		Name	Agency	Email	Telephone
1		N	Bruce Abanathie	STANCOG	BABANATHIE@Stancog.org	209)558-7830
2		N	Jason Crow	SACOG	Jcrow@sacog.org	(916)340-6219
3		N	Mayela Sosa	FHWA	Mayela.Sosa@igate.fhwa.dot.gov	(916)498-5022
4	✓	P	Abhijit Bagde	CT-HQ	abhijit_bagde@dot.ca.gov	(916)654-3638
5	✓	P	Alex Smith	FTA	Alex.smith@fta.dot.gov	(415)744-2599
6	✓	T	Bob Swensen	CT-HQ	Bob.swensen@dot.ca.gov	(916)654-4366
7	✓	P	Cathy Gomes	CT-HQ	Cathy.Gomes@dot.ca.gov	(916)654-3271
8	✓	P	Doug Nguyen	CT-HQ	Dung.Nguyen@dot.ca.gov	(916)654-4843
9	✓	P	John Asuncion	SBCAG	jasuncion@sbcag.org	(805)961-8915
10	✓	P	Leigh Levine	FHWA	Leigh.levine@fhwa.dot.gov	(916)498-5034
11	✓	P	Lorraine Lerman	FTA	lorraine.lerman@fta.dot.gov	(415)744-2735
12	✓	P	Muhaned Aljabiry	CT-HQ	Muhaned_aljabiry@dot.ca.gov	(916)654-3521
13	✓	P	Rachel Falsetti	CT-HQ	Rachel.falsetti@dot.ca.gov	(916)654-2983
14	✓	P	Raymond Odunlami	MTC	rodunlami@mtc.ca.gov	(510)464-7717
15	✓	P	Rick Ballantyne	COFCG	rickb@fresnocog.org	(559)233-4148
16	✓	P	Shaun Ng	CT-HQ	Shaun.Ng@dot.ca.gov	(916)654-4221
17	✓	P	Ted M. Matley	FTA	Ted.Matley@fta.dot.gov	(415)744-2590
18	✓	P	Wade Hobbs	FHWA	wade.hobbs@fhwa.dot.gov	(916)498-5027
19	✓	T	Consuelo Medina	CT-D10	Consuelo.Medina@dot.ca.gov	(209)948-3975
20	✓	T	Dan Little	Shasta	dlittle@co.shasta.ca.us	(530)245-6819
21	✓	T	Gwendolyn Denny	CT-D 11	gwendolyn_denny@dot.ca.gov	(858)616-6526
22	✓	T	Ivan Garcia	BCAG	igarcia@bcag.org	(530)879-2468
23	✓	T	Ken Lobeck	RCTC	KLobeck@rctc.org	(909) 787-7141
24	✓	T	Laura Fields	CT-D1	lfields@dot.ca.gov	(707)445-6358
25	✓	T	Mac Cavalli	CT-D6	Mcavalli@dot.ca.gov	(559)445-5285
26	✓	T	Marc Reynolds	TRPA	mreynolds@trpa.org	(775)588-4547 ext. 302
27	✓	T	Olin Woods	SACOG	owoods@sacog.org	(916)340-6220
28		T	Rosemary Ayala	SCAG	AYALA@scag.ca.gov	(213)236-1927
29	✓	T	Scott Butler	SJCOG	Sbutler@sjcog.org	(209)468-3913
30	✓	T	Shannon MlCoch	CT-HQ	Shannon_Mlcoch@dot.ca.gov	(916)653-6750
31	✓	T	Sookyung Kim	SANDAG	ski@sandag.cog.ca.us	(619)595-5350
32	✓	T	Sue Hall	SLOCOG	Shall@slocog.org	(805)781-4255
33	✓	T	Tammie Baumgarten	CT-D 11	Tammie.Baumgarten@dot.ca.gov	(619)688-3152
34	✓	T	Ted Smalley	TCAG	TSmalley@co.tulare.ca.us	(559)733-6653 ext. 4888
35	✓	T	Terri Lewis	MCAG	terri@mcag.cog.ca.us	(209)723-3153 ext. 307
36		T1	Nancy Wickersham	CT-D5	Nancy_Wickersham@dot.ca.gov	(805)549-3074
37	✓	T1	Sarah Chesebro	CT-D5	Sarah_chesebro@dot.ca.gov	(805)549-3640
38	✓	T1	Sharon Fasulo	CT-D5	Sharon.Fasulo@dot.ca.gov	(805) 549-3319
39	✓	T2	Scott Sauer	CT-D3	Scott.sauer@dot.ca.gov	(916)274-0612
40	✓	T2	Susan Wilson	CT-D3	susan.wilson@dot.ca.gov	(916)274-0639
41	✓	T3	Paul Fagan	CT-D8	Paul_Fagan@dot.ca.gov	(909)388-7016
42	✓	T3	Sue Hays	CT-D8	Sue_Hays@dot.ca.gov	(909)383-7589
43		T4	Joseph Stramaglia	KCOG	jstramaglia@kerncog.org	(661)861-2191
44	✓	T4	Raquel Carabajal	KCOG	rcarabajal@kerncog.org	(661)861-2191
45			Bob Lowrie	CT-D 11	Bob.lowrie@dot.ca.gov	(619)688-6784
46	✓		Bob Stone	MCTC	bobmctc@psnw.com	(559)675-0721
47			Chan Kuoch	CT-D7	Chan.Kuoch@dot.ca.gov	(213)897-2781
48	✓	P	Cornelius N Harris Jr.	STANCOG	charris@stancog.org	(209)558-4864
49			Diane Nguyen	SJCOG	Dnguyen@sjcog.org	(209)468-3913
50			Don Doutt	CT-D 2	Don.Doutt@dot.ca.gov	(530)225-3574
51	✓	P	Donna Turchie	FTA	Donna.Turchie@fta.dot.gov	(415)744-2737
52			Ekaraj Phomsavath	FHWA	Ekaraj.Phomsavath@fhwa.dot.gov	

53			Hymie Luden	FTA	Hymie.luden@fta.dot.gov	(415)744-2732
54			Jean Mazur	FHWA	Jean.mazur@fhwa.dot.gov	(916)498-5732
55	✓	P	Jerome Wiggins	FTA	Jerome.wiggins@fta.dot.gov	(415)744-2819
56			Laurie Barton	STANCOG	Lbarton@stancog.org	(209)558-4836
57			Lisa Poe	SANBAG	LPoe@sanbag.ca.gov	(909) 884-8276 ext.156
58			Patricia Taylor-Maley	MCTC	triciamctc@psnw.com	(559) 675-0721
59			Paul Page	FTA	paul.page@fta.dot.gov	(415)744-2734
60	✓	P	Ray Sukys	FTA	Ray.sukys@fta.dot.gov	(415)744-2802
61	✓	P	Ross McKeown	MTC	rmckeown@mtc.ca.gov	(510)464-7842
62			Shirley Medina	RCTC	SMEDINA@rctc.org	
63			Sima Memari	CT-D4	Sima_Memari@dot.ca.gov	(510)286-5762
64			Sue Kiser	FHWA	Sue.Kiser@fhwa.ca.gov	(916)498-5009
65			Terri King	KCAG	TKing@co.kings.ca.us	(559)582-3211 ext. 2678
66			Todd Muck	AMBAG	tmuck@ambag.org	(831)883-3750
67			Vince Angelino	STANCOG	Vangelino@stancog.org	(209)558-4867
68	✓	T	Gary Vettese	CT-D2		

P= In person=19

T= By telephone=28

CALIFORNIA FEDERAL PROGRAMMING GROUP (CFPG)
MEETING MINUTES – JANUARY 15, 2004

The CFPG meeting was held at the Federal Transit Administration in San Francisco from 10:30 to 12:30.

1. Topics/Agenda/Introductions:

Meeting started with self-introduction of attendees and review of the agenda items.

2. Ground Rules:

Muhaned Aljabiry went over the following ground rules for the meeting.

- Since there are phone participants, everyone who speaks should state his/her name and agency.
- Keep comments as brief as possible
- Stick to the current agenda item. Additional items not in the agenda will be added to the end and will be discussed if time permits.
- Turn off cell phones and limit interruptions
- This is a forum to hear everyone's concerns comments and suggestions. Please make sure your voice is heard.
- Facilitator to ask before moving on to the next item if anyone on the phone has any additional comments on the item, then pause for a few seconds.
- Respond to follow up items and meeting notices by the deadlines.
- Except for follow up items, the minutes will include discussions that take place during the meeting only. If you do not want what you say during the meeting included in the minutes, state "off the record".

3. Announcements/ Approval of the 10/08/03 CFPG meeting minutes:

Doug Nguyen announced that the reporting mechanism in CTIPS will be changed and training will be offered to MPOs before implementation of the new system in CTIPS. He also mentioned that the new system would provide more flexibility in generating reports compared with the existing one. Doug also mentioned that the proposed training would be a "hands-on" training session. It was also decided to hold the training session along with the next CFPG meeting in February 2004 in Sacramento. Meeting date to be decided at a later date.

Meeting minutes for November 18, 2003 CFPG meeting were approved with no changes.

4. Follow-up items from last meeting:

1. Letter to survey whether CTIPS support cost reporting change is supported by all: Done. Muhaned Aljabiry sent the note to all CFPG members. Most people surveyed support the change.
2. Notifications to MPOs prior to change in CTIPS for support costs to combine with Capital costs (if survey above is "Yes"):
See Item No. 8 "Combining Support cost in CTIPS with Capital cost"
3. Grouped projects and minor change draft guidelines:
Draft summary of the guidelines (Handout 1) was distributed to the CFPG members for review.

4. Obligation information received by SACOG from FTA for FY 2002:
Item moved to the next meeting, as Jason Crow of SACOG did not attend the meeting.
5. E-mail requesting volunteers for “Grouped projects and minor change draft guidelines” Task Force:
This item has been completed. Jason Crow, Ross Mckeown and Raymond Odunlami were added as members.
6. Meeting with Federal Resources – CT to get more information from FADS:
This item was moved to the next CFPG meeting.
7. Get information from FTA on TEAM database:
Ivan Garcia mentioned that Rosemary Ayala would contact Ted Mately to seek more information on the FTA’s TEAM database. Jerome Wiggins mentioned that if an MPO were a direct recipient of FTA funds, it must have received access privileges to the database. Raymond Odunlami stressed the need to mimic TEAM report to match FTIP listings. Ray Sukys said that it was possible to get “Read only” access for all MPOs to TEAM database, but also stressed that possibility of any modifications to the reporting mechanism was very remote.
8. Contact CT – Local Assistance for project list for lump sums for State administered programs:
Item completed.
9. Updated agency contact list:
Item completed. The list on FTIP website was also updated with the new information. Any contact list was sent out as part of the agenda. (Handout 3)

5. Annual listing Taskforce Progress Report:

The Task Force would meet with FHWA’s Finance Group on January 21, 2004 to discuss whether a report can be written in FIMIS to generate the required obligation data rather than have the State or the MPOs go through the time consuming process. . Muhaned Aljabiry told the group that State couldn’t commit itself to providing these reports in future, as generating them involved a very time consuming process.

6. Grouped projects and minor changes and communication process for State Managed Grouped Project Listing:

Rachel Falsetti mentioned that summary of the guidelines for grouped projects and minor changes were distributed to all CFPG members. She also mentioned that the final guidelines would include detailed information and asked MPOs to forward any comments on the summary handout to the State.

Shannon Mlcoch with the Caltrans HQ - Local Assistance presented the “Communication Process for State Managed Group Project Listings (Handout 2)” to the group. She also mentioned that HQ - Local Assistance would forward the project lists for various state-managed programs to Caltrans Programming Office by January 23, 2004 and Programming Office would distribute the lists to all MPOs. Shannon also suggested that MPOs should work with their District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE) to come to a consensus regarding eligible projects for grouping. MPOs then would send the information to HQ – programming by February 27, 2004. HQ - Local Assistance would forward the final project lists to

Programming Office on March 5, 2004 for distribution to MPOs. Comments on the Communication Process for State Managed Group Project Listings should be sent to Muhaned Aljabiry and he will forward all comments to Shannon.

7. Financial Constraint of the FTIP:

Abhijit Bagde referred the group to the letter sent by the State to MPOs on November 4, 2003, which included guidelines an MPO might use for demonstrating financial constraint of its FTIP. He suggested MPOs to contact the State (FTIP Office) for any assistance, if required.

8. Combining Support cost in CTIPS with Capital cost:

Rachel Falsetti asked the group the justification for combining support cost in CTIPS with Capital cost. Raymond Odunlami provided reference to the federal regulation that support combining of support cost with Capital cost.

Rachel mentioned that she would look into it in detail.

Doug mentioned that technically it was possible to implement it in the CTIPS but suggested that the business practice needed more evaluation prior to implementation in CTIPS.

9. 2004 FTIP/FSTIP workshop:

Rachel Falsetti announced that the State would not be conducting a 2004 FTIP/FSTIP workshop in March 2004 as announced at the November 18, 2003 CFPG meeting. Instead the State would conduct presentations on “Financial Constraint” and “Grouped Projects and Minor Changes Guidelines” and communication process for State Managed Grouped Project Listing” in upcoming CFPG meetings.

10. CTIPS for 2004 FTIP/FSTIP:

Doug Nguyen told the group that as 2004 STIP would not be approved by CTC till August 2004, therefore MPOs would not be able to transfer the projects from 2004 STIP to 2004 FTIP in CTIPS due to time constraint. Instead he suggested that MPOs could generate 2004 FTIP from 2002 FTIP by creating new versions of the STIP projects instead of transferring from STIP 2004, as no new projects would be programmed in 2004 STIP.

11. Fund Estimate:

Rachel Falsetti informed the group that CTC adopted the 2004 Fund Estimate (FE) in December 2003. She also mentioned that the State presented FE to FHWA on January 13, 2004 and FHWA concurred with the State that MPOs could use FE to develop their 2004 FTIPs. She announced that the State

would send correspondence to all MPOs regarding the assumption of FE as basis to develop 2004 FTIPs.

Rachel also mentioned that in the event of change in the State Budget in July 2004, FHWA would adopt FSTIP based on FE and would potentially deem it to be not financially constraint.

12. Q & A from November Workshop:

Leigh Levine mentioned that as a result of the Planning, Programming and Air Quality Workshop conducted in November 2003, there were a number of questions that FHWA staff indicated they would look further into. Leigh announced that response to those questions had been forwarded to CFPG members and asked the group to contact FHWA for further assistance.(See handout 4)

13. Open Forum & Next meeting date and location:

Muhaned Aljabiry announced the following dates and locations for CFPG meetings. He also mentioned that March 2nd CFPG meeting might be advanced to February 2004 to coincide with the CTIPS training in February 2004. Details to be announced at a later date.

2004 CFPG Meetings:

The meeting dates and locations have been revised as follows due to the CTIPS training that will be held in Sacramento on February 19, 2004:

DATE	LOCATION
February 19, 2004	CT - Sacramento
April 6, 2004	SACOG
May 18, 2004	FHWA
June 29, 2004	MTC

Follow up items:

<u>Item</u>	<u>By</u>	<u>Due Date</u>	
1. Letter to MPOs recommending use of 2004 Fund Estimate to develop 2004 FTIPs	CT-FTIP	Feb. 18, 2004	
2. Review comments on summary "Grouped Projects And Minor Change Guidelines" and "Communication Process for State Managed Grouped Project Listing to CT-FTIP	All	Feb. 18, 2004	
4.3. Obligation information received by SACOG from FTA for FY 2002	SACOG	Feb. 18, 2004	
5.4. Meeting with Federal Resources – CT to get more	CT-FTIP	by next mtg.	

Information from FADS

~~6.5.~~ Annual listing Taskforce to meet with FHWA's Finance Group

Task Force

Done

|

8. Distribution of Local Assistance for project list for Lump sums for State administered programs to MPOs

CT-FTIP

Jan 30, 2004

(Handout 1)

Subject: Update on the FSTIP Change Guidelines

The California Federal Programming Group (CFPG) task force has prepared a preliminary draft of guidelines for the administration of amendments to individual and grouped projects included in a metropolitan or Federal statewide TIP starting with the 2004 FSTIP. These guidelines will replace the current administrative amendment approval process, which will no longer be acceptable to FHWA/FTA. Absent these guidelines most FSTIP amendments will have to go through the sequential Federal Approval process.

The preliminary guidelines have been developed around three possible types of changes to the Federal statewide TIP:

- I. *Administrative Changes*, requiring no FHWA or FTA approval;
(*These are not the current Administrative Amendments*)
- II. *“Minor Change” and “Grouped Project” Amendments*, that may be approved using expedited approval procedures (i.e., concurrent approvals, electronic documentation, etc.) agreed to by the State and Federal Agencies; and
- III. *Major Amendments* (formerly “formal” amendments).

Include is a summary of the most significant or noteworthy concepts currently being developed or advanced.

A few details on each of the three types of amendments in the draft guidelines are presented below.

The Three Types of Changes to the FSTIP

Administrative Changes:

Administrative changes to the Federal statewide TIP that only change the source or category of funds listed for a project, or only change the year listed in the federal TIP or STIP for the “obligation” of funds for the project, do not require the approval of the FHWA or FTA. No public involvement process is required for Administrative changes. A letter of notification, of the change, from the MPO must be sent to all the involved parties: State, FHWA, and FTA.

Minor Change and Grouped Project Amendments:

- Changes to the listing for a group of projects in the TIP, or a “minor change” to the listing for an individually listed (regionally significant or federally funded) project in the TIP, may be proposed for expedited approval by the Governor and concurrent approval by the federal agencies for inclusion in California’s Federal statewide TIP. California Department of Transportation (Department) has a delegated approval authority from the Governor. Expedited approval means that proposed amendments to the Federal statewide TIP that are approved by the Governor and accepted by the Department as a “minor change” amendment will be approved concurrently by the Federal Highway (FHWA) and Transit Administrations (FTA) for inclusion in the Federal statewide TIP. The States approval will mean that the FHWA and FTA have agreed to the approval of the amendment.
- The following section highlights minor change criteria, identified by the task force, for use in identifying a “minor change” amendment to the FSTIP that is suitable for “expedited approval” by the Department and the Federal agencies.
- Changes to listed project description information. Changes to the listed descriptive information may generally be approved as a minor change to the Federal statewide TIP provided the amended project(s) remain consistent with the design concept and scope assumed for the project(s) in carrying out the transportation planning and AQ conformity determination processes that resulted in the project being included in the Federal statewide TIP, and if applicable, the metropolitan transportation plan and TIP. The description change must be consistent with the project description cleared in the NEPA or CEQA process.
- Changes to total project cost information. Changes to the total cost listed for a project may generally be approved as a minor change to the Federal statewide TIP provided the proposed change is less than 20 percent of the total cost listed in the Federal TIP/STIP for the projects less than \$10 million. The allowable

change decreases slightly for projects with a total listed cost greater than \$10 million and there are exceptions for splits and combines

- Changes to the amount of proposed funding for a phase. Changes to the amount of funding for a phase in the Federal Statewide TIP may generally be approved as a minor change provided the proposed change is less than 20 percent of the remaining cost for the planned and programmed phases of the project
 - Changes to Grouped Project Listings by the addition and/or deletion of a project in the grouping may be approved as long as the maximum change in the total project listing cost remains within the dollars amounts listed in the criteria above.
 - Changes to the listed lead agency or agencies. Changes to the lead agency or agencies listed in the Federal statewide TIP may generally be approved as a minor change.
 - Splitting and Combining Project Listings. An amendment that solely splits an individual project listing into separate listings for two or more project implementation stages may be approved as a minor change. An amendment that solely combines the TIP listing for two or more stages of a regionally significant project into a single individual project listing may be approved as a minor change.
 - Shifting Construction funds. Shifting Construction funds to add a PE or a R/W phase to a project may be approved as a minor change.
-
- The alternative to using the Minor Change or Grouped Project Amendment process is to use the Amendment process (formerly “formal amendment” process) outlined in 23 CFR 450.216 and 450.326.
 - The State and each MPO wishing to use the expedited approval procedures for a Grouped Project listing amendment must adopt an appropriate policy concerning the administration of the grouped project program listing.

The following is an example of an appropriate policy for expedited approval of amendments to a grouped project listing in the Federal statewide TIP:

“Amendments to the program listing for a grouping of projects in the Federal transportation improvement program will only be proposed for expedited approval by the Governor, and concurrent approval for inclusion in the Federal statewide TIP by the Federal agencies, when the project listing for the grouped projects is administered in a manner consistent with the guidelines acceptable to the State and Federal agencies.”

- The State and each MPO wishing to use the expedited approval procedures for a “minor change” to an individually listed project in the Federal statewide TIP must adopt an appropriate policy concerning the administration and acceptable criteria for the classification of an amendment as a “minor change.”

The following is an example of an appropriate policy for the expedited approval of a minor change amendment to an individually listed project in the Federal statewide TIP:

“Amendments to the program listing for an individually listed project will only be proposed for expedited approval by the Governor, and concurrent approval for inclusion in the Federal statewide TIP by the Federal agencies, when the proposed changes are consistent with the “minor change” criteria described in the guidelines acceptable to the State and Federal agencies.”

- The State proposes to maintain copies of the MPO and State policies governing the administration of grouped project listings and minor change amendments and to provide this information to the federal agencies.

Major Amendments (formerly “formal” amendments)

Proposed amendments to the Federal statewide TIP, other than Administrative or Minor Change amendments discussed above, must be developed in accord with the provisions of 23 CFR 450.326 and/or 23 CFR 450.216, and approved by the Federal agencies in accordance with 23 CFR 450.220. In general terms, these regulations state the TIP or STIP may be modified at any time consistent with the procedures agreed to by the cooperating parties for developing the Federal TIP or STIP and all other Federal requirements in 23 CFR part 450

concerning the development, public involvement, and Federal agencies approval of the Federal TIP or STIP.

(Handout 2)

COMMUNICATION PROCESS FOR STATE-MANAGED GROUPED PROJECT LISTINGS

This document is separated into two sections: one for SHOPP Program groupings and one for non-SHOPP programs groupings.

Communication Process for Project Grouping Under SHOPP Program

The SHOPP program can be grouped into the six different listings as shown in Appendix A.

The following process outlines grouping of SHOPP projects for the adopted FTIP. For the development of a new FTIP, a similar process can be followed without the need for processing a “Minor Change” amendment.

MPOs intending to group SHOPP projects must do a one-time “Minor Change” amendment to initiate the process to match the proposed guidelines.

1. CTIPS office will add a check box called “Grouped in FTIP” in the SHOPP “Project Definition” screen of CTIPS.
2. CTIPS office will populate the above field with a check mark for all projects in the non-MPO rural counties. HQ FTIP office will assist as needed.
3. CTIPS Office to prepare “canned” report under FTIP that provides information, as of a certain date, about grouped projects and the projects that are “ineligible for grouping”. The ability to run reports as of a certain date would enable one to check the data against what is/was in the FTIP at a given period (provided no “backdoor” happened!). “Last updated date” may be used to provide this functionality.
 - a. One report would provide a summary of groupings by category, and within each category the summary of dollar amounts by fund types. The report will be as shown in example below:

San Diego Association of Governments
SHOPP Project Grouping Summary

Grouping Category: Mobility

Information as of: 01/31/04

See Note1	(Dollars in thousands)					
	Total	Prior	04/05*	05/06*	06/07*	Beyond
NH						
STP						
IM						
Local						
Total						

Note: This is what FHWA and FTA wants to see listed in the FTIP for groupings. But MPOs should keep the backup details in house that rolls up to this, as in report (b) below

* FYs should automatically reflect the current FTIP cycle

Note 1: Fund types shown in the example are not all inclusive. Need to list all fund types applicable to projects in the category being grouped

- b. The second report is a detailed report that would provide the information about the projects that constitute each grouping. See example below.

San Diego Association of Governments
SHOPP Project Grouping Detail

Grouping Category: Mobility

Information as of: 06/19/03

Dist	PPNO	County	Route	PM	Implementing Agency	Project Description
11	2500					
11	2213					
11	5489					
11	2200B					
Total 4 Projects						

Note: This is what FHWA and FTA wants to see as a backup for groupings. But MPOs should keep the \$ details in house that rolls up to the report (a) above to substantiate audits.

- c. The third report is a detailed report that would provide information about the projects that are not part of any grouping. This is very similar to the formats that are currently in use. See example below.

San Diego Association of Governments

Individually Listed SHOPP Projects

Information as of: 06/19/03

Dist	PPNO	Co	Rte	PM	Project Description	Fund Type**	(Dollars in thousands)								
							Total	Prior	02/03*	03/04*	04/05*	Beyond	PE	RW	CON
11	2500	SD	5	1.0	Operational Impvmts	NH									
						STP									
						IM									
						Local									
						Total									
11	2000A	SD	15	2.0	Operational Impvmts	IM									
						Total									

Total 2 Projects

* FYs should automatically reflect the current FTIP cycle

** Fund types shown in the example are not all inclusive. Need to list all fund types applicable to the project being listed.

4. **Within 60 days from date of adoption** of the “Guidelines for Project Grouping and Minor Changes”, the MPO will notify HQ FTIP office of their desire to group/not group SHOPP projects in their area. Caltrans District offices will play a key role in helping their MPO(s) make this decision.
5. On receipt of such notice, HQ FTIP office will request HQ SHOPP to provide a list of all SHOPP projects by the six different groups for each MPO. HQ FTIP office will forward this list to the MPOs and their corresponding Caltrans District offices.
6. Based on consultation among the MPOs and their respective District offices, the MPO will identify the projects that are to be grouped. The category of grouping will be based on the Caltrans “Accounting Code” (see Appendix A). (HQ SHOPP yet to provide the “Accounting Codes” to be considered under each grouping in the Appendix). MPOs to use the “Project Grouping and Minor Changes” guidelines to identify eligibility of these projects for grouping. If

requested by the MPO/District, HQ FTIP Office will provide necessary assistance in determining the suitability of projects for grouping.

7. Once the MPO identifies the projects that are to be grouped, it will initiate a one-time “Minor Change” amendment to delete the existing “SHOPP Lumpsum” from the FTIP and add the groupings identified in the above step, and also individually list any project that was previously under “SHOPP Lumpsum” and are now identified for individual listing. State approval is required for this “Minor Change” amendment. Note: The “minor change” amendment is applicable to the individual listings for this one-time only (see Note). Note: MPOs to determine if an air quality conformity determination would be needed for the projects found to be listed individually. If conformity determination is required, these projects should be amended to the FTIP through a “Formal Amendment” process along with the conformity findings.
8. When Caltrans District requests HQ SHOPP for a SHOPP amendment to modify/delete existing project(s) that is part of a “grouping” or to add a new project, a copy of that request will be sent to the respective MPO. Such amendment requests to modify/delete grouped project(s) shall clearly identify the existing projects that would become ineligible for “grouping” after approval of the SHOPP amendment. If the amendment request is to add new project, the request shall identify whether the project would be eligible for grouping and the category under which it would be grouped. Districts shall work with the MPOs to determine project eligibility for grouping.
9. HQ SHOPP amendment approval letter or Cover memo will contain a boilerplate language that instructs the district to contact their MPO to initiate FTIP amendment for any project that was identified by the district as ineligible for “grouping”. The FTIP amendments for such projects ineligible for grouping will be “Formal Amendments”, as they were already determined by the MPO and the district to be ineligible for grouping. For such ineligible projects, Districts and the MPOs may start the FTIP process concurrently with the SHOPP amendment process, if it is very likely that SHOPP amendment will be approved by Caltrans HQ.
10. Once the one-time amendment mentioned in step 7 is performed, changes to the groupings in the FTIP will be updated at least every six months or in conjunction with the FTIP adoption, whichever occurs earlier. The District and the MPO to come up with their “six-month” schedule.
11. The HQ FTIP office and FHWA will periodically audit the MPOs’ SHOPP project groupings listed in the FTIP by running the “canned report” from SHOPP. If the FTIP listing for the grouping did not match the “canned report” and the date of the last FTIP approval of the grouping in CTIPS is over six months, the MPO will receive a notification from the State (HQ FTIP office) requesting an update to the grouping.
12. This communication process shall be re-visited in conjunction with the re-examination of the adopted “Guidelines for Project Grouping and Minor Changes”.

SHOPP Minor Projects

Since minor projects are not federalized and by nature are not significant, minor projects will be grouped under the title of “Caltrans SHOPP Minor Projects Grouping”. Each year, CTC approves an allocation for the SHOPP minor program. The grouping will only contain the yearly total of the dollar amounts approved by the CTC. Caltrans HQ Federal program, in consultation with Caltrans HQ SHOPP office, will provide the dollar amounts to the MPOs by county. This information will be provided at the beginning of each state fiscal year. There will be no updates between the yearly information provided.

Minor Projects to be listed individually

Caltrans district offices should work with their MPO counterparts to ensure Minor projects that are ineligible for grouping (see “Guidelines for Project Grouping and Minor Changes”) are listed individually in the respective FTIP. As there may be very few projects that may fall under this case, and also since the dollar value of minor projects are relatively small, listing some of the minor projects individually does not require revision to the annual dollar information provided by Caltrans.

Caltrans Managed non-SHOPP Programs Groupings

Following are the non-SHOPP programs managed by Caltrans:

- A. Local Bridge Program
- B. Local Seismic Program
- C. Local HES program
- D. Safe Route to School Program (SR2S)
- E. Local Section 130/Grade Crossings Program

Though Caltrans HQ Division of Rail manages the Section 130 Grade Crossings Program, HQ Local Assistance will be the lead in providing the information for that program for the purpose of providing consistency across all non-SHOPP programs managed by Caltrans.

The Caltrans managed non-SHOPP FSTIP Grouping definitions can be found in Appendix B.

Following are the steps required to provide the MPOs with the information needed to develop their TIPs:

1. HQ Local Assistance will modify the program database(s) to include a field that will identify whether a particular project is grouped in the FTIP.:-
2. HQ Local Assistance to inventory all existing projects in the five programs mentioned above and capture specific project description in the databases of the respective programs. Certain information identifying location and scope (for Local Bridge; facility carried/crossed and work category), at a minimum, is to be included in the initial submittal. More detailed descriptions of scope will be added as new projects are approved and changes are made to existing projects. It may take up to two years to complete the detailed description for the entire database depending on resources. The description should aid the MPOs in making decision on whether or not to group a particular project. Description should be consistent with the sample project description standard approved by FHWA and FTA and provided to Local Assistance at the July 7, 2003 meeting. HQ Local Assistance will make a preliminary suggestion on projects ineligible for grouping.
3. HQ Local Assistance will submit reports a, b and c as shown below to HQ Programming beginning in January 2004 and will be submitted twice a year thereafter in January and July. Each round of submittals will include a draft and a final report. The first submittal will be a draft. and districts (Local Assistance & Programming) the inventory of existing projects with suggested eligibility for grouping. (Shannon Mleoch to provide a date by which this would be completed) Following are the reports HQ Local Assistance will provide to HQ Federal Programming to aid the MPOs in listing the Caltrans managed non-SHOPP program projects in the FTIP.
 - a. This report would provide a summary of groupings by category and within each category the summary of dollar amounts by fund types. The report will be as shown in example below:

San Diego Association of Governments
Caltrans Managed non-SHOPP Programs Grouping Summary

Grouping Category: Local Bridge Rehab/Replacement (Category names y determined by Local Assistance)

Note: This is what FHWA and FTA want to see listed in the FTIP for groupings. But grouping manager should keep the backup details in house that rolls up to this, as in report (b) below

See Note1	(Dollars in thousands)					
Fund type	Total	Prior	04/05*	05/06*	06/07*	Beyond
HBRR						
Local Bridge Match						
Total						

* FYs should automatically reflect the current FTIP cycle

Note 1: Fund type(s) shown in the pertains only to the grouping. The example are shows the local bridge program, which uses HBRR funds. Other groupings may have multiple funding types, which must all be listed, not all inclusive HQ Local Assistance is responsible for showing grouping fund type(s) and match only.

- Total=Total funds programmed for projects not yet authorized (obligated) for construction
- Prior=Total program funds obligated for projects not yet authorized for construction + funds programmed for obligation in prior years but not yet obligated (these are programmed funds for projects not yet authorized for construction that did not obligate those funds in the prior years in which they were scheduled, in other words, projects that slipped but provided no schedule updates)
- Triennial yr funds programmed= Total unobligated funds programmed for that year
- Beyond= Funds programmed beyond the triennial cycle shown

b. The second report is a detailed report that would provide the information about the projects that constitute each grouping. See example below.

San Diego Association of Governments
Caltrans Managed non-SHOPP Program Grouping Detail

Grouping Category: Local Bridge

Dist	CT ID*	County	Implementing Agency	Project Description	Location
11					
11					
11					
11					
4 Projects					

** Project-CT ID is the unique identifier provided to the project in the Caltrans Local Assistance or Rail Managed database for the respective program; For bridges and grade crossings, it is the respective bridge or grade crossing #.

- c. The third report is a detailed report that would provide information about the projects that are not part of any grouping. This is very similar to the formats that are currently in use. See example below.

Note: This is what FHWA and FTA want to see as a backup for groupings. But the Caltrans Program Managers MPOs should keep the \$ details in house that roll up to the report (a) above to substantiate

San Diego Association of Governments

Individually Listed Caltrans Managed non-SHOPP Projects

Dist	CT ID***	County	Implementing Agency	Project Description	Fund Type**	(Dollars in thousands)								
						Total	Prior	04/05*	05/06*	06/07*	Beyond	PE	RW	CON
11	57C9995	San Diego	City of San Diego	Replace two lane bridge with 10 lane bridge	HBRR									
					Match									
					Total									
11	57C9994	San Diego	City of San Diego	Bridge painting	HBRR									
					Match									
					Total									

Total 2 Projects

* FYs should automatically reflect the current FTIP cycle

** Fund types shown in the example are not all inclusive. Caltrans managed programs will list their program funds and the non-federal funds required to match the program funds only. MPOs are responsible for Need to listing all other fund types applicable to the project being listed.

Steps 4 – 10 below show the general process:

4. HQ Local Assistance prepares draft reports and transmits to HQ Federal Programming
5. HQ Federal Programming to send draft reports to MPOs
6. MPOs to work with District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE) and local agencies to come to a consensus (with copies to their district counterparts) regarding which projects are eligible for grouping. For projects in the Local Bridge Program Grouping and individually listed HBRRP funded projects, DLAE will enter this and other related information into the HBRRP database and will notify HQ Local Assistance when complete. For all other programs, the MPOs will mark up draft reports and return them to HQ Federal Programming.
7. HQ Federal Programming will forward the draft reports to HQ Local Assistance.
8. HQ Local Assistance completes the final reports and submits to HQ Federal Programming.
9. HQ Federal Programming will forward the final reports to the MPOs
- 8.10. MPOs to do a one-time minor change amendment that deletes the existing lumpsums and adds the new groupings based on the final report. Projects recommended for individual listing are added through formal amendment.

(Steps 1 through 8 are one-time set-up actions)

9.11. Amendments to the Local Assistance Managed Program Groupings

The FTIPs need to be amended whenever changes are made to the Caltrans Managed non-SHOPP programs that would necessitate changes to the FTIP grouping or individually listed projects. The following changes are commonly encountered:

- a. Addition/Deletion of projects
- b. Modification to the cost/scope/schedule of existing projects

a. Addition/Deletion

Grouped Projects: On approval of Local Agency request to add to/delete from the *Grouped Project Listing*, HQ Local Assistance will update its grouping total and the backup listing and provide it to the MPOs during the biannual update of the grouping.

Individually listed Projects: On approval of the request to add to/delete projects from the program, the Caltrans DLAE will direct the agency requesting such approval to contact their respective MPO to update the FTIP. The MPO will be copied on this direction.

b. Modifications to the cost/scope/schedule of existing projects

Grouped Projects: See Addition/Deletion above

Individually listed projects: See Addition/Deletion above

Note: When an MPO decides to amend their FTIP to take a project out of a *Grouped Project Listing* and list it individually in their FTIP for reasons other than Air Quality conformity, funding actions (authorizations) can continue without waiting for the approval of the amendment to the FSTIP.

Appendix A

SHOPP FSTIP Grouping Definitions

Overview

Introduction	Six project groupings are identified for the SHOPP FSTIP grouping. These groupings are defined using activities listed under 40 CFR 93.126 & 127 Tables 2 and 3.
---------------------	--

[Grouping Definitions](#)

Collision Reduction - SHOPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Railroad/highway crossing• Hazard elimination program• Safer non-Federal-aid system roads• Shoulder improvements• Increasing sight distance• Safety improvement program• Intersection signalization projects at individual intersections• Railroad/highway crossing warning devices• Guardrails, median barriers, crash cushions• Skid treatments• Adding medians
------------------------------------	---

Bridge Preservation - SHOPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes)
------------------------------------	--

Roadway Preservation - SHOPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pavement resurfacing and/or rehabilitation• Emergency relief (23 U.S.C. 125)• Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes)
-------------------------------------	--

Roadside Preservation - SHOPP	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fencing.• Safety roadside rest areas
--------------------------------------	---

Mobility

- Railroad/highway crossing.
 - Safer non-Federal-aid system roads Shoulder improvements
 - Shoulder improvements
 - Traffic control devices and operating assistance other than signalization projects
 - Intersection signalization projects at individual intersections
 - Pavement marking demonstration
 - Truck climbing lanes outside the urbanized area
 - Lighting improvements
 - Emergency truck pullovers
-

Appendix B

Caltrans Managed Non-SHOPP FSTIP Grouping Definitions

Overview

Introduction

These groupings are defined using activities listed under 40 CFR 93.126 & 127 Tables 2 & 3.

Groupings & Responsible Divisions

The following groupings and the responsible Caltrans divisions are listed below:

Grouping	Responsible Division
Local Bridge	HQ Local Assistance
Local Seismic	HQ Local Assistance
Local HES	HQ Local Assistance
Safe Routes to School (SR2S)	HQ Local Assistance
Local Section 130/Grade Crossings	HQ Rail

[Grouping Definitions](#)

Local Bridge

- Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes).
 - Guardrails, median barriers, crash cushions.
-

Local Seismic

- Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes).
-

Local HES

- Hazard elimination program.
-

SR2S

- Shoulder improvements.
 - Increasing sight distance.
 - Safety improvement program.
 - Traffic control devices and operating assistance other than signalization projects.
 - Fencing.
 - Lighting improvements.
 - Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes).
 - Bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
-

**Local Section
130/Grade
Crossings**

- Railroad/highway crossing.
 - Hazard elimination program.
 - Shoulder improvements.
 - Traffic control devices and operating assistance other than signalization projects.
 - Railroad/highway crossing warning devices.
 - Guardrails, median barriers, crash cushions.
 - Pavement resurfacing and /or rehabilitation.
 - Adding medians.
 - Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes).
 - Bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
-

(Handout 4)

Planning, Programming and Air Quality Workshop Q&A

As a result of the Planning, Programming and Air Quality Workshop this past November, there were a number of questions that FHWA staff indicated we would look further into, and that has been done. Now that many of those matters have been resolved, we felt it would be appropriate to share the details of the solutions with both those who were able to participate in the workshop, and those who missed that opportunity. You will find below a list of issues and the responses that have been determined.

1) Can MPO Boards approve an FTIP/RTP with a deferred effective date for the conformity determination if EPA has not yet found the mobile source emissions budgets adequate for conformity purposes?

FHWA and FTA will consider this type of action on a case-by-case basis. Preferably, EPA will have found the mobile source emissions budgets adequate prior to the MPO making the conformity determination on the FTIP/RTP.

If an MPO would have to adopt an FTIP/RTP prior to EPA's adequacy finding, the resolution should state that the adoption and the conformity determination will become effective upon the effective date of the published Federal Register announcing the EPA's adequacy finding for the mobile source emissions budgets. However, FHWA/FTA may not take an action on a submitted FTIP/RTP until EPA adequacy finding has become effective and the MPO Board approval becomes applicable.

2) Can MPO Boards concurrently approve both an FTIP/RTP and an Interim or Exempt FTIP/RTP, to ease the transition in the event that conformity cannot be determined?

No. An MPO can have only one approved and valid FTIP/RTP at any given time. Once another FTIP/RTP is approved, any other previously approved FTIP/RTP is no longer valid. FHWA/FTA will not take action on a document that contains two separate and distinct FTIP/RTP documents. What an MPO can do, however, to ease the transition in the event of a forthcoming lapse, is to include a list of exempt projects in its FTIP/RTP, to be used in the development of an Interim/Exempt FTIP/RTP in the event of a pending conformity lapse. The subsequent interim FTIP/RTP would still require an independent public comment period consistent with the MPO's adopted public participation procedures.

3) Will reliance upon a previous emissions analysis be acceptable if the previous analysis was performed using an older version of the EMFAC emissions model?

Yes. Reliance on a previous emissions analysis in a conformity determination is acceptable in the event that the previous analysis was performed using a previous version of the EMFAC model. In that case, the MPO would have to demonstrate compliance with all applicable transportation planning and conformity requirements such as financial constraint, timely implementation of transportation control measures, and 40 CFR 93.122 (e), relying upon a previous emissions analysis. Conformity to all available adequate and approved budgets (including those that were not adequate or approved when the previous emissions analysis was completed) must be demonstrated when a new determination relies upon a previous emissions analysis.

4) Will MPO staff be able to use the Draft Fund Estimate from CTC for planning and programming purposes in the development of their FTIPs?

FHWA and FTA are working with Caltrans toward an affirmative response to this question. We anticipate reaching an understanding with Caltrans by the end of January and communicating it to the MPOs at the same time.

5) Revisit the MOU between FHWA, FTA and EPA that disallows the third year extension of the FTIP for nonattainment and maintenance areas.

The FHWA Division discussed this suggestion with FHWA Headquarters office. They explained that the requirement to update the FTIP every two years is a statutory requirement. FHWA and FTA do not have the regulatory authority to provide additional flexibility.